

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
10/057,958	01/29/2002	Michael Basara	3687-21	3563	
23117	7590 06/18/2004		EXAM	EXAMINER	
NIXON & VANDERHYE, PC		MEREK, J	MEREK, JOSEPH C		
8TH FLOOR	D ROND		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
ARLINGTON, VA 22201-4714		3727			

DATE MAILED: 06/18/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			1				
	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
Advisory Action	10/057,958	BASARA, MICHAEL	· ^4				
, Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit	\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\				
	Joseph C. Merek	3727					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address							
THE REPLY FILED 11 May 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Apple Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	void abandonment of this applic 1) a timely filed amendment whi	cation. A proper rep ch places the applic	oly to a cation in				
PERIOD FOR RE	EPLY [check either a) or b)]						
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.							
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adverse, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).	an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date o	f the final rejection.					
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The dathave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exten 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three more earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	sion and the corresponding amount of the I statutory period for reply originally set in	fee. The appropriate ext the final Office action; or	tension fee under (2) as set forth in				
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant' 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF							
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:							
(a) they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);							
(b) ⊠ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);							
(c) they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	in better form for appeal by mat	erially reducing or s	simplifying the				
(d) they present additional claims without cancel	ling a corresponding number of	finally rejected clair	ns.				
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.			,				
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection	ction(s):						
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).							
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: See		sidered but does NC	OT place the				
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which we	re newly				
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims w			and an				
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:							
Claim(s) allowed:							
Claim(s) objected to:							
Claim(s) rejected: 7-9.							
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:							
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) approved or b) disapproved by the Examiner.							
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme		<u> </u>	1				
10. ☐ Other:		The LIXA	(

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 11-03) Continuation Sheet (PTOL-303) 110/057,958

Application No.

Continuation of 2. NOTE: The amendment to the specification adds new matter. Applicant did not appreciate at the time the invention was filed that the outer layer cannot penetrate through the inner layer. The fact that the drawings do not show this occurring does not provide support for excluding it from occurring.

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The previous rejections are maintained by the examiner The references are so closely related that the combinations are obvious. Gits '722 teacehs making a key where the outer layer does not penetrate the inner layer as seen in Fig. 9. Boehm et al teaches a similar struture where the outer layer does not penetrate the inner layer where the inner layer is smooth. Danielson et al and Morin teach that the outer layer can penetrate the inner layer. One of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that it is a matter of choice to allow the outer layer to penetrate the inner layer or to provide an non-penetrated inner layer.